Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/899,090	BEELMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	N. Bhat	1764
All Participants:	Status of Application:	· · ·
(1) <u>N. Bhat</u> .	(3)	·
(2) <u>H. Nebel</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>1 June 2005</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	opplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  New matter rejection claim 9		
Claims discussed: Possible 103 over Murch et al. in view of Lehmann et al.		
Prior art documents discussed:  Murch et al. in view of Lehmann et al.		
Part II.	•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	BENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		•
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The examiner will provide a writter arate record of the substance of the</li> </ul>	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
		•
	•	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)
• • • •	•	• • • •

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated to applicant's representative that in order to obviate the 103 rejection applicant should recite that after contact with the antimicrobial solution having a pH between 9-11, the mushroom is rinsed with a neutralizing/browning inhibitor solution comprosing erythorbic acid, sodium erythorbate or combinations therof wherein the mushrooms are returned to mushroom physiological pH. Applicant's attorney agreed to the changes in order to advance prosecution and to allow the re-issue application.